



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/584,978	06/02/2000	Dr. Rudi Neirinckx	44334	5707
35928	7590	03/31/2005	EXAMINER	
DLA PIPER RUDNICK GRAY CARY US, LLP 1625 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW SUITE 300 WASHINGTON, DC 20036-2247				RUSSEL, JEFFREY E
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		1654		

DATE MAILED: 03/31/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/584,978	NEIRINCKX, DR. RUDI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeffrey E. Russel	1654	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 January 2005.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 11-13, 15 and 16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 11-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 15 and 16 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
2. Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the administration of a combination of EGF and sulfadiazine, does not reasonably provide enablement for the administration of EGF not in combination with sulfadiazine. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. Factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, have been described in *In re Colianni*, 195 USPQ 150 (CCPA 1977) and have been adopted by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546 (BPAI 1986). Among these factors are: (1) the nature of the invention; (2) the state of the prior art; (3) the relative skill of those in the art; (4) the predictability or unpredictability of the art; (5) the breadth of the claims; (6) the amount of direction or guidance presented; (7) the presence or absence of working examples; and (8) the quantity of experimentation necessary. With respect to (1), the nature of the invention is the treatment of psoriasis in human patients with compositions comprising EGF, and optionally sulfadiazine or an anti-inflammatory. With respect to (2), the prior art of record does not teach using EGF to treat psoriasis in human patients. With respect to (3), the relative skill of those in the art is high. With respect to (4), according to the declaration by Inventor Neirinckx filed July 20, 2004, "there is no way to predict that a proposed treatment of psoriasis

will be successful without an actual clinical trial". Therefore, it would not be possible to predict, in the absence of clinical trials, whether the treatment of psoriasis in humans outlined at page 2, third paragraph, would be successful if carried out with one less active ingredient. With respect to (5), the claims embrace administration of EGF without the administration of sulfadiazine. With respect to (6), Applicants' specification does not provide any direction or guidance as to how to administer EGF in the absence of sulfadiazine while still being able to treat psoriasis in humans. With respect to (7), there are no working examples in which psoriasis in humans is treated with EGF in the absence of sulfadiazine. The working example is limited to the use of combinations of EGF and sulfadiazine. With respect to (8), the quantity of experimentation necessary to practice the invention would be relatively great, requiring at least clinical trials in order to determine whether EGF in the absence of sulfadiazine can be used to treat psoriasis in humans. When the above factors are weighed, and especially in light of factor (4), it is the examiner's position that one skilled in the art could not practice the invention without undue experimentation.

3. Applicant's arguments filed January 26, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The rejection of claims 11-13 on the basis of lack of enablement is maintained. Applicants contend that sulfadiazine is an excipient/preservative which has no impact on psoriasis, and therefore the specification enables the use of EGF by itself to treat psoriasis. However, Applicants' argument is unsupported by evidence and therefore can not be relied upon to rebut the enablement rejection. For example, the specification does not state that sulfadiazine

Art Unit: 1654

has no impact on psoriasis. Further, Applicant's argument is contradicted by the Phan et al article applied in the previous Office action, which states that silver sulfadiazine is useful in the treatment of psoriasis.


4. Claims 15 and 16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey E. Russel at telephone number (571) 272-0969. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor Bruce Campell can be reached at (571) 272-0974. The fax number for formal communications to be entered into the record is (571) 273-8300; for informal communications such as proposed amendments, the fax number (571) 273-0969 can be used. The telephone number for the Technology Center 1600 receptionist is (571) 272-1600.



Jeffrey E. Russell

Primary Patent Examiner

Art Unit 1654

JRussel

March 25, 2005